Proper Names In the Light of Theoretical
Onomastics (Part I)

Vincent Blanar (Bratislava)

Две противоположные, но взаимосвязанные тенденции характеризуют статус имен собственных – постоянное их взаимодействие с остальной частью словаря и со всей системой языка, с одной стороны, и постоянное противопоставление категории имен собственных категории апеллятивов, с другой. Из этого проистекает и двойственный характер категории *nomen proprium*. Имя собственное это двусторонний языковой знак особого рода. Его содержательная сторона состоит из двух компонентов. На уровне системы (lange) иерархически представленное множество надиндивидуальных онимически релевантных признаков имени формируют его онимическое значение (пресуппозиционная идентификация). В тексте и речи собственное имя относится к индивидуальному онимическому объекту (референциальная идентификация).

Two opposing but interrelated tendencies are typical of the position of proper names – a continuous interaction of proper names with other vocabulary and the whole language system and, simultaneously, a continuous polarization of the category of proper names in relation to appellatives. From this binary interrelationship of proper names follows the binary status of the category *nomen proprium*. The proper name is a bilateral linguistic sign *sui generis*. Its content aspects consist of two components. At the system level hierarchical set of supra-individual onymically relevant features of a name forms its onymic meaning (presuppositional identification). In text and in speech, a proper name refers to an individual oymic object (reference identification).

1. Introduction. Binary role of proper names

A proper name is a vocabulary element of a particular language which also belongs to a respective onymic subsystem, thereby acquiring a binary character. Proper names are formed (as a secondary plan of a language) with the background of appellative vocabulary. However, in their formation and use in communication, not only are the rules of the appellative language code applied but also the rules specific to proper names. Two opposing but interrelated tendencies are typical of the position of proper names - a continuous interaction of proper names with other vocabulary and the whole language system and, simultaneously, a continuous polarisation of the category of proper names in relation to appellatives. The interaction of proper names with other vocabulary relates to the ongoing processes of onymisation (appellative → proprium) and apellativisation (proprium → appellative) with the openness of onymy (the social, historical, cultural as well as the political dimensions of proper names present a wide range of possibilities for, e.g. the adoption of exonyms) but, above all, it relates to the social needs of ordinary communication. The polarisation of proper names in relation to appellatives is, hence, conditioned by the special character of onymic nomination. From this binary interrelationship of proper names follows the binary status of the category nomen proprium, i.e. linguistic status and onomastic status. In the analysis of proper names and from the methodological standpoint in onomastics, I consider this to be fundamental. That is why, after the older characterisation of onomastics, I have extended the definition of the linguistic status of proper names as defined by Kuryłowicz (*La position linguistique du nom propre*, 1956) to linguistic and onomastic status (Blanár, 1976, 1977).

2. 1. The linguistic and onomastic status of proper names

The dual status of the proper name in language (the name as an element of the vocabulary of a language and simultaneously an element of an onymic set) is a crucial starting point in comprehending its special status and the valuation of proper names in a language. Naming individuals of the same species is a special case of nomination. It is the most detailed classification of real phenomena by language means which is induced by social needs to communicate (social communicational needs). In comparison with basic appellative lexis, proper names are a "secondary stratum" of naming (e.g. Kuryłowicz, 1956; Zabrocki, 1960) and in respect of these special naming needs they are classified as marked as opposed to the unmarked common nouns. To denote the most universal feature of propria, I use an integrating term <socially determined identification / differentiation of generic individuals>. This term combines several common and basic functions of proper names: nominative, individualising and differentiative (on onymic functions in greater detail see Knappová, 1992; Šrámek, 1999).[1]

The close relationship between the linguistic and onomastic status of a proper name can be observed in onymic nomination, identification and differentiation.

In onymic nomination (in the philosophy of language, the term "baptism" is used) an individual of a given class is named as an individually existing object. In this naming, any language form (grammatical form, prepositional phrase, minimal utterance, abbreviation etc.) is substantiated, e.g. *Tuším - I guess, Nazad - Back, Driapsa - Climb*; terrain names *Hlboké - the Deep, Medzi vršky - Between Hills*, chrematonyms *Vojna a mier - War and Peace, Nový čas - New Times*. Where surnames are concerned, so-called parasystem formations are almost typical, which extend the naming inventory that is necessary to identify / differentiate unambiguously by forms which do not have counterparts in the appellative field or which are formed by marginal word-forming procedures, e.g. *Vrbinčík, Nestriga, Podhora, Odnechta, Nechajdoma, Neradovič, Nemtuda*, etc. In constructing a statement, these "secondary" formations are incorporated into a text as substantives but the morphological categories of gender, number and case are used in a manner typical of individual onymic classes (in detail ch. 2.4.).

In onymic identification and differentiation, an individual "*1*" of the class of species A, hence *A1,* is excluded from other individuals "*2*", "*3*"... "*n*" of the class of species *A* and individuals of other classes hence, *A1 : A2 : A3 ... An : B..., C... N*. This identification and differentiation in logic and the philosophy of language is perceived in a simplified way as "exclusion of individuals" (e.g. Zouhar, 2004).[2] However, this is not just a less precise expression

---

[1] The use of an *(onymic) function* and *feature* is not uniform. In my functional approach to onymic phenomena and relations I have in mind the most general features of proper names and pragmatic and grammatical features which are characteristic of individual onymic sub-systems. On these terms, more in chapter 2.2.

[2] The speculations of logicians (and philosophers, too) about the character of the proper name only partially coincide with the views of experts in linguistics and onomastics. The reason lies in the different aim of their research and different aspects of research. Logicians and philosophers analyse the proper name in isolation and not as a component of an onymic system. The second reason is the differing definition of the aims of the research; proper names as involved in onomastics and logic differ (see e.g. Zouhar, 2004). To our understanding, proper names have their onymic semantics formed by several specifically onymic features (not just the "rigid designator" as used by Kripke). The basic elements of onymic systems have model values which also differ within one onymic system by their frequency and area distribution. In language communication, proper names fulfil a role of identification and differentiation. The analysis of isolated proper names, whatever aspect we use, does not make for understanding of their basic character.

of the same phenomenon. The explicit reference to a class of onymic phenomena within which an individual is identified in reference and in contrast to other individuals of the same class (and theoretically to other classes) does not have a negligible cognitive significance. A certain onymic class (sub-system) is implicitly involved whose naming elements have a content different from the homophonic names of other onymic classes (sub-systems). For example, in the naming of persons, a new fact is to be taken into account. In many situations in communication, a person A1 is named also as a member of a certain kinship. At the level of the system, this is a feature of <± family affiliation> which is the area "specifically onomastic": This is to be discussed further in the text.

Using the form *Martin* as an example, let us compare onymic objects with the proprial sphere of singulative naming.

The toponym *Martin* is a singulative (single-denotated) name of a town in the Turiec region. A common, specifically onymic element of the content of toponyms is their relatively close link with the location of an onymic object <location feature>. Geographical names have strong local and time dimensions. The distribution of geographical names in a terrain represents a toponymic context (Karpenko, 1967, p. 4).

The form *Martin* can also be a first name and a surname. For the class of persons, classification by their social and family membership is characteristic. Unlike the surname, the features of <family affiliation> and <heredity> at a negative stage are applied to the first name. (On *Martin* as surname, see text below).

The lexeme *Martin* is also used as a name of a historical description of this town. In this case, it stands for a chrematonym which characterises the links with the economic, productive and cultural activity of a man. The name is a serial product of mass objects which are interchangeable (Šrámek, 1999, p. 14). This extensive group of objects is characterised by a feature of <serial>. The above generic features are used to distinguish several categories of onymic classes. Here, the forms *Martin* represent homonymous proprial formations.

However, proprial homonymy reaches into such internally varied sub-systems as (official and unofficial // living) anthroponyms. The form *Martin* can be a Christian name, surname, a living family name in unofficial naming and also a nickname used by a small clique for a boy with the less common name *Theophilus*. These are various functional components whose different onymic validity is supported by some specifying onymic features (E.-M. Christoph, 1987 onoseme can be considered). *Martin* as a Christian name is an individual name of a person which is given to a person at his birth; in the official binary naming system it is a determining functional component in relation with a surname, it expresses family affiliation and heredity at a negative stage; in a first naming system, it was a basic component of personal naming. The surname *Martin* is a hereditary functional component which expresses affiliation with a family; it is a basic (determined) component of the official naming system. In the official naming, *Martin* as the basic component of a naming unit is linked with features of <heredity> and <family affiliation>. In the system of living names, the form *Martin* can also be a nickname used in a small school society. – The individual functional components are characterised by a specific set of onoseme and that is why they are of different onymic validity.

The following are important to the character of an onymic sign and onymic classes: the socially significant characteristics of individual classes of onymic objects as well as the pragmatic attitudes of users of a name towards onymic objects and their naming are integrated in the designation of a proper name as its onymic features. In geographical names, these features are

motivated by the linkage of a name to the respective onymic object in the terrain and the socially important or typical character of a residential or non-residential site, respectively. Where personal names are concerned, these are properties characterising living beings in their fundamental social relations, such as relations within family. For the full category of geonyms and bionyms, more general features of < stabilisation by administrative and legal standards > and < stabilisation by a restricted (local) social convention> are typical. On the basis of these generic features, I distinguish between official onymic systems and systems which operate within semi-official and private relations. Differentiation between official and unofficial naming is of essential significance, especially in anthropomastics.

2. 2. Functional and system view of onymy

The above facts lead on to some general observations:

1. Specifically onymic semantic elements are a content component of an onymic sign. A proper name is a linguistic sign (e.g. on personal name, Horecký, 2005) but it must be stressed: as a linguistic sign sui generis. The content and form of an onymic sign are closely interrelated and at a proprial level they have a specific form. The interrelations in their content and formal aspects are discussed in detail below.

2. On the basis of the above analyses, it is possible to formulate a certain conclusion about the structural organisation of onymy. Individual classes of proper names are not only open sets of onymic entities; they are also functionally organised subsystems. The definition of terms and categories of *function* and *feature* makes us better able to comprehend the functional principle in onomastics. For example, R. Šrámek develops his arguments on this topic as follows: A function of the form *Brno* is to identify a certain object and differentiate it from other objects of its class. Generally speaking, the term *function* can be defined as "to be something, to exist, act as something". "Function is an expression of the ability to apply certain feaures by either differentiation or integration"…"The proprial function becomes the content of the proprium" (Šrámek, 1999, p. 21). This viewpoint, in its substance, develops on the well-known thesis by G. Frege (1892) who claims that "the meaning of a proper name is the object itself". Also R. Carnap (1956) sees the existence of an individual term in the object which it names. By contrast, the category *feature* "involves a range and type of semantically distinctive characteristics which determine or specify an extent and type of functions…and functional action". The feature, then, is "the ability to grasp the semantic content of a function and its orientation". It can be concluded that, in onymy also, categories such as f*unction*, *functionality* and *feature* establish the basic organising systematising principle. Due to its functionality, onymy also has a systematic character and "langue" character. Kalverkämper (1998) and Kohlheim (1997) hold similar views. This definition belongs to a broader research context in which systematisation is defined as a unity and coordination of functional, model and communicative aspects. Kohlheim (1977, p. 71) draws on a similar systematic and "langue" comprehension of a proprial sphere and he distingushes as virtual units *nomemes* which are realised in communication as different variations (*allonomy*) of proper names (see Šrámek, 1999, p. 49, 113).

2. 3. The content aspect of an onymic sign

The following interpretation of the content of an onymic sign is a contribution to the centuries-old discussion on the significance of a proper name.

Hansack's cognitivistic concept of proper names (1990, 2004) stems from a position of natural sciences; he understands natural language as a language programmer. Linguistic signs are bearers of a set of information which only refer to "meanings" and hence they have a unilateral character. Hansack's theory was further developed by S. Brendler in a lecture given at the 21ˢᵗ International Congress in Uppsala (2002) "Über den gerechten Tod der Auffassung vom Namen als bilaterales Zeichen". This contribution is, in a certain sense, bellum contra omnes; however, the strong words often conceal simplifying explanations which do not serve to endorse Hansack's theory. Hence, Hansack, sourcing from the cognitivistic language theory built on a natural basis, does not provide answers to the theoretical questions raised from positions of the discipline of proper names itself. However, the construct of knowing an onymic object (see also Blanár, 1996 and elsewhere) is contributory. According to Hansack, signs (words) just refer to "meanings"; the information set of features which is delivered by a linguistic sign is as far as terms are concerned "theoretically indefinitive". There is an obvious difference between language competence as it is applied in ordinary communication (meanings which are linked to a language form are familiar to the communicating persons and facilitate mutual understanding) while, with regard to proper names, the speaker has to become familiar with names of generic individuals in order to e.g. effect a reference relationship in a dialogue. Knowledge of an onymic object differs by individual (from names of generally known objects through those partially known to the unknown). A usual familiarisation with an onymic object named (a prerequisite of identification) in a dialogue is a common method of exchange of thoughts. The viewpoint (of S. Brendler) is dubious that the relation of an appellative with its denotat is identical with the relation between a proper name and an onymic object. For a proper name, from the social aspect and the aspect of communication, the characteristic properties and signs of *every* individual of a given (onymic) class are important for identification and differentiation.

The formulation (Hansack, 2004, pp. 55 – 64) can be accepted that a proper name does not take the place of an onymic object; it is more a data set about this object in the human mind. In my understanding and terminology, this encyclopaedic information is just one component of the onymic content of a proper name which is applied at the level of communication. However, this is not the sole aspect of the content of an onymic sign. The following comments on Hansack's understanding of a broad range of "meaning" of a proper name, data set resulting in knowledge of an onymic object, are fundamental:

1. Two groups of phenomena must be distinguished within an open set of information elements. The first group includes individually different elements of information which support the identification and differentiation of individual onymic objects in common communication (e.g. age of the person named, his or her height, his or her appearance, address, etc.). This knowledge is not identical for both the communicating persons, but certain information important to a common communication is to be expected. The second group consists of socially recognised elements of meaning, beyond the individual, which are exclusively characteristic of a particular onymic class. These are specifically onymic features which form the onymic semantics (designation) of a given onymic class (subsystem). These are – as mentioned in the previous discussion – e.g. <localisation> <± residence> with toponyms, <family affiliation>, <± heredity> with bionyms and other largely pragmatic features related to the manner of "baptism".

2. Although E. Hansack opposes the solution of basic problems in theoretical onomastics from positions of philosophy, he perpetuates this traditional line by the fact that he does not understand the proper name as an element of a particular onymic class, of a given subsystem. The

analysis of proper names in the appellative context (A : P : A) and especially in the proprial context (P : P : P) makes it possible to extract the above onymically relevant elements of content, mostly of a pragmatic character. They are specifying onymic features which represent the most general principles of naming in the proprial sphere and their hierarchical sets are characteristic of individual classes (subsystems) of proper names. These hierarchical sets of specifically onymic features constitute the onymic semantics (designation) as the second component of the content of an onymic sign. I define this as presuppositional identification. While *reference identification* is characterised as a phenomenon at the level of communication, *presuppositional identification* is of a systemic, "langue" character. It refers to the content of whole classes of propria in deep structure regardless of information on or realisation of an onymic object.[3] Hence, the onymic sign has its content and its form. Its content consists of two components: reference identification and presuppositional identification (onymic meaning). It should be stressed that the application of reference identification assumes the knowledge of a respective onymic class (genus proximum), i.e. the hierarchically highest feature; other pre-suppositional features are neutralised in common communication. With regard to ordinary communication, this fact is important from the communication point of view with homonymic proper names (compare the discussions about the form of *Martin* earlier in the text) and especially with internally varied anthroponymic subsystems. The given semiotic understanding of proprium facilitates the distinguishing of the individual functional components of proper names (Christian name, surname, nickname, living family name etc.) as special classes of names of different onymic validity (semantics).

The content aspect of an onymic sign cannot be isolated from its formal aspect.

2. 4. Interrelation between the content and formal aspects of an onymic sign

Onymic features are realised in the language in various ways. This is most evident in the language aspect of personal names which vary in their onymic content, and their language structure forms, in many aspects, are a noteworthy part of the lexis of a national language. (That is why we mostly focus on anthroponymic signs). From this point of view, the question has not been studied systematically. In the following text I will proceed according to the hierarchy of onymic features (see Blanár, 2001). Onymic features are, in their way, reflected in the formal aspect of an onymic sign in a given subsystem and in the social and communicational conditions established. Here I analyse the situation in the Slovak language.

Features of grammatical character

1. A general feature of propria which has a functional and integrational character **<socially determined identification / differentiation>** is applied in proprial nomination to the proper name as an independently existing entity. Any language form is substantiated in the validity of the proper name. As far as the language structure is concerned, there are sets of proper names which are richly varied: compare personal names *Krátky - Short, Zlejší-Worse, Mlkvik-Quiet, Nesvadba, Ozembuch,* anoikonyms *Pri pieskoch By Sands, Medzi potoky-Between Streams,* chrematonyms *Kadernícky salón Katka-Hairdressers' Katka,* a novel *Komu zvonia do hrobu-For Whom The Bell Tolls,* logonyms *A + B, TIP-TOP*. The inventory of names extends in respect of various situations of

---

[3] It is of interest to note that, in the semantic aspect of a proper name, the term denotat (designat) of a proper name is different in logic and the philosophy of language; it is understood as an abstract, arbitrary individual (occurrence de dicto; S. Kripke: rigidity de iure) and in the empirical aspect, the referent of a proper name as an empirical unit (usage de re; S. Kripke: rigidity de facto)- see Materna, 1998; Gahér, 2006; Zouhar, 2006.

naming by the selection of lexemes (which in appellative form often do not have pendants) and also by less common word-forming procedures (Blanár, 1950, 1996, 2005 and elsewhere). Let us cite, for example, the revaluation of the desinential morphemes to the derivational morphemes in the process of the substantiation of grammatical forms: *Oberaj, -a, -ovi; Zapletal, -a, -ovi..., Tomašových, -a, -ovi..., Nebojsa, -u, -ovi...;* the univerbalisation of combinations of words: *Starigazda, Zátroch, Zedvora;* the existence of variations of prepositional anoikonyms allows for the creation of a complete paradigm: *Pri pieskoch – By Sands// Piesky - Sands, Medzi potoky -Between Streams / Potoky - Streams*. A characteristic feature of proper names is the specific usage of the category of gender, number and case when the proper name becomes part of an oral or written text. Several examples of the category of gender follow. Personal names have natural gender. The category of gender of masculine living propria is one of the most active factors in the declination of proper names which in onymisation determines inter-paradigmatic shifts of extensive parts of lexis. In the process of onymisation, paradigmatic reconstruction affects masculine inanimate, feminine and neuter nouns. A characteristic procedure is an internal lingual solution of the discrepancies between the natural gender of a motivating member (masculine person) and a motivated word which does not belong to the class of masculine persons, e.g. *hlava (head)* → surname *Hlava, hruška (pear)*→ surname *Hruška, kurča (chicken)* → surname *Kurča* (surnames are declined following the pattern "hrdina" – hero).

The ways in which a set of proper names is extended have their typological differences. For example, for Slavic names (especially Western-Slavic) it is characteristic that the extension of a set of surnames proceeds from the positions of derivational morphemes *(Adam: Adam-čík, -ec, -ička, -ko, -ovič* etc.) The inventory of surnames in many Western European languages is extended by names which have an article of a declined masculine or feminine gender in front of the base morpheme, e.g. Italian *De Amicis, Della Casa,* French *Dupont, Aucassin,* Spanish *Las Casas*, German *Ten Hoff*, often with a prepositional conjunction: *Zumbusch, Andermatt* (Blanár, 1996, p. 118). It is interesting to recall that a group of personal names which are without pendant in the appellative field was extended by the naming inventory as early as in the Ancient anthroponymy. Such forms were frequent, especially amongst composites (Haraj, 2006).

2. <Natural gender of personal names> For the paradigmatic aspect of personal names, it is extremely important that namings of persons have not the grammatical but the natural gender. Compare: (ten) *Adam, Krivý, Vrana, Stehno – (tá) Eva, Soňa, Krivá, Vranová, Stehnová*. If the ending does not allow for the categorisation of a name into a respective paradigm, the natural gender is considered in naming a living person: (a son) *Jakubove, Mišeje, Dobiášé Dolních;* (a daughter) *Jakubove, Mišeje, Jožova Krivého*. Names like (a child) *Adamča, Marienča, Štrekárča, Kalíča* represent marginal cases with colloquial coloration. The polarisation of proprial and appellative lexis is remarkable in the declension and formation of feminine surnames from masculine surnames and masculine living family names. Inter-paradigmatic shifts of these layers of anthroponyms are the most dynamic agents in the declension of personal names.

Declension according to the animate gender paradigm is usually applied to chrematonyms which were formed from appellative or proprial masculine personal names; the acc. sing. of masculine names of daily newspapers and magazines is declined according to animate gender paradigm: (to read) *Budovateľa, Bojovníka,* dat. and loc. sing. declension proceeds according to animate or inanimate gender paradigm: *v Čitateľovi // Čitateli (in Reader)*, *o Bojovníkovi // Bojovníku* (*about Fighter*) .

When a proper name from a certain class of propria is used as the name of an onymic object of another class of propria, its designation (more precisely, its content model) will change; the name establishes a homonymic relation with the original name. This transition from one onymic class to another (transonymation) is also frequently accompanied by changes in morphology and changes in word-formation. The paradigm changes mainly in cases when the motivating lexeme is a personal name. Some examples follow:

personal name → local name :

masculine names are declined by inanimate paradigms: *vo Svätom Petre(in Saint Peter's)*

personal name → geographical/terrain name:

surname *Ondrejka* (declined by "hrdina" – hero) – a meadow *Ondrejka* (declined by "žena" – woman)

personal name → names of days and seasons:

na Ondreja (on Andrew's), po Ondreji (after Andrew's); na Mateja, po Mateji

a name of a region, village, river → surname:

surnames *Orava, Žilina, Nitra, Dunaj, Kubín* are declined by masculine animate paradigms (more in Blanár, 2005).

This vigorous tendency towards declension, which, in general, is characteristic of colloquial communication, copes with serious difficulties in cases of logonyms which quite often are unusual in their structure. Such peripheral naming units are represented mainly by acronyms, compare, e.g. ONAKO, SEKO, SFIG, TOPTEKS (Imrichová, 2002).

Features of pragmatic and communicational character

3. <The stabilisation of a name by administrative and legal standards and by a restricted social (local) convention, resp.> plays a basic role in the pragmatic features. This feature makes it possible to distinguish between official and unofficial living naming or, more precisely - between official onymic systems whose basic form is written and onymic systems which exist in oral semi-official and private contact. Between official and unofficial naming, there exists a wide spectrum of semi-official functionings of a personal name in various naming situations (see, e.g. Kany, 1995).

In the functioning of onymic systems in social communication, the most complex situation arises with the naming of persons. In the naming of persons in official contact, a system of official naming and in unofficial and private contact, a system of living unofficial names have been constituted. Both systems coexist in close relations. Differences between official and unofficial anthroponymic systems result in a number of functional components, the scope of motivation, in structure and distribution of models. In our works *Živé osobné mená na strednom Slovensku - Living Personal Names in Central Slovakia* (Blanár – Matejčík, I. 1 1978, I. 2 1983) and *Teória vlastného mena* [The Theory of Personal Names] (1996, in German 2001) we demonstrated the principles of the organisation of anthroponymic systems in deep structure and their functioning in social communication. A surname has an officially stable form which does not translate into a foreign language.

The situation in current unofficial naming is different. Living names act in communication as colloquial formations. Research into living names in Central Slovakia has revealed that the

proportion of surnames in models of living names is quite high. Living names, on the one hand, continue their old historical development (microsystems with rich functional components are often involved); on the other hand, they follow the process of official naming.

4. <± Family affiliation> This is an essential anthroponymic feature in the development of personal naming. It has two forms. In an old first naming system, it was (and in living names it still frequently is) applied at a negative stage (–). In an official binary naming system, it is an < affiliation with the family as a whole >.

In a first naming system, a person is not named as a member of a family but he or she is named as a person as such (*Koza, Pribina, Mojtech).* Personal (and later Christian) names frequently developed in the past from an individual characteristic. The individual characteristic was motivated by the name of the father (*Janovic),* mother (*Tom/ova, Tom/owna);* patronyms and matronyms are typical of Eastern and Southern Slavs. With the Western Slavs, the name of a location, the place of living, and the work (*Anton Podhradký - Undercastle, Juro Masár - Butcher*), origin (*Oravec*), physical or mental characteristics (*Tichý - Quiet*), etc. of a named person is a more usual motive.

The set of anthropolexemes of European personal names was substantially affected by Christianity. As a result of the spread of Christianity, the names of biblical and early saints were introduced into the old local anthroponymy. The Christian names gradually become the productive layer which is adopted in a new language environment. In the naming of members of a higher society and of more densely inhabited places, new anthroponymic features are gradually being applied which are linked to the component which, up to that point, had the determining role. The functional component was the bearer of this essentially important semantics from the viewpoint of personal naming, i.e. it expressed that the feature <kinship with a family as a whole> was linked with the feature <heredity>. Due to these features, hierarchically, it became the basic component of a model of naming. In such a way, the surname was constituted as the new functional component. The Christian name took the position of the determining component. The so-called first naming system was transformed into a binary naming system.

Since, in the naming of persons, not only are individuals identified and differentiated as such but also certain means of expression are used to designate their relatives and non-relatives respectively; in anthroponymy, in addition to the means and procedures common in nomination in the appellative area, the means typical of the proprial area are also used. A characteristic feature of the anthroponymic system is making a distinction between related and non-related persons. The rule which differentiates the naming of relatives and non-relatives in combining the Christian name with the surname also merits our attention. Let us consider a model scheme x + A in the binary system:

x + A	y + A	z + A
x + A1	y + A1	z + A1
x + B	y + B	z + B
Ján Murár	*Michal Murár*	*Karol Murár*
Ján Murárik	*Michal Murárik*	*Karol Murárik*
Ján Točík	*Michal Točík*	*Karol Točík.*

If a Christian name (determinant) *x, y, z* - changes along a horizontal line and the surname (determiné) *A, A1, B* stays unchanged, consanguineous siblings are named. If surname *A, A1, B* in a vertical line is changed and the Christian name does not change, members of other families are named (see Blanár, 1945, 1950). This rule is modified in cases in which, in the stable binary naming system, persons who are not related have the same surname and in cases where their kinship ties are loosened by further branching of consanguineous relatives. The possibilities for identification (and derivation) are not equal in the first naming and binary naming systems. In the first naming system, lexical selection and specifically anthroponymic word-forming procedures carry the most weight. In the binary naming system, the surname is the determining factor in expressing family affiliations. That is why, in the class of surnames, the group of anthropolexemes as well as the group of anthropoformants spreads so remarkably. Specificity of expression of proper names is demonstrated most clearly in the lingual formation of surnames.

5. <± Heredity of proper name> is a matter of personal naming. Heredity is demonstrated in functional components that are established by a more restrictive social convention and in the stabilisation of a name by administrative and legal standards in a different way.

In the old first naming system, hierarchically, the personal name was the basic component in a narrow sense (Ger. Rufname) which was not a hereditary element (e.g. *Matej, Jakuš* Gašpara). Later, the individual characteristic could gain the validity of a byname (e.g. *Stefan Diakovic // Stefan Diak*) by possible adoption of the heredity feature. The current subsystem of living names recognises non-hereditary functional components (*Jozef Zimen – Ščefiny Dzurajky Jožko*) as well as hereditary functional components (*Michal Palovčík – Palovčík od Cestárov; Ondrej Šmihula – Šmihula Belko*). The heredity of living family names is linked to a social convention in certain regions.

The inheritance of a new functional component – surname – starts the procedure of the change of the first naming system into the binary naming system. This results from the need to identify the named persons unambiguously in common communication and in official documents. The establishment of the state-political units with a developed administration and legal standards and the effort of privileged groups to strengthen their legal ownership by means of a well-established family name were the important driving forces towards restructuring in the naming system (see also Pulgram 1950–1). The new functional component had (officially) a constant form and was inherited by consanguineous relatives down the line of male descendants.

The motivation of a family surname by a particular onymic situation is coded in its language form but, in the process of inheritance, the live motivation relation of the surname becomes less important and it is irrelevant in common communication. Forms like *Holovič, Pisarčík, Jakubíček* can, in morphemic and word-formation analysis, be categorised into their individual morphemes but the derivational morphemes function only as means to differentiation. By contrast, the motivation of non-hereditary living names indicates the current circumstances of naming; compare *Ondro Bitkár (Fighter), Juro Amerikán (American), Drotár (Wire - worker), Jedinák Rybnický, Jula Na uhle*. The live motivation of unofficial names is frequently used in artistic speech.

6. <± Obligatory character of a name> This is just a marginal item in the category of personal names which is abstracted away in the developmental and pragmatic approach. The positive stage of obligatory (+) is a characteristic of personal names in the old first naming system and later for groups of Christian names. In the official binary naming system, this feature characterises the basic

components of the naming scheme (Christian name, patronymic, matronymic, surname). The basic form of these functional components is standard, written and also colloquial. The effect it has on the language form deals with the stability of the official naming (it is related also to aspects of spelling and grammar). In the negative stage (–), <obligation of a name> characterises the functional components of unofficial naming (individual characteristics, nickname, byname, living family name and name of house). The basic form of these functional components is colloquial and regional. It also includes hypocoristic forms within a very small social radius (e.g. nicknames used within a family: *Mufo, Igiboj, Majko,* etc.). The negative stage of obligatory <obligation for a name> is manifested in communication in the more restricted stability of a colloquial form of an unofficial name.

7. <± Validity of a name from birth> This feature in the positive stage (+) relates to personal names in the first naming system in the narrower sense, and in the binary naming system it relates to Christian names and surnames. It is concerned with "baptism", with selection from relatively well-established sets which, however, have certain dynamics (extension, stabilisation, assimilation of foreign names). In the old first naming system, this feature in the negative stage (−) relates to an individual characteristic, nickname and byname, in the unofficial naming of rich sets of living names which are characterised by local economic and social conditions and where the expressiveness of naming means is applied more significantly.

8. <± Expressiveness> This feature is more frequent in personal names and less frequent in geographical names; its usage in various classes of chrematonyms would require a special analysis.

Motivation of geographical names indicates some aspects of a naming situation. Expressiveness is attained by a selection of emotionally coloured lexemes or an unusual connection of components in complex naming, compare, e.g. *Čertiak – the Devil, V židáku – In the Jewish Part, Bohov chrbát – the God's Back, Somárska lúka – Easy Slope.* In ordinary communication, the identification function of a name diminishes its original strong, even vulgar, expressiveness (a name of a meadow *Do riti – Up Arsehole).*

For surnames, the feature of expressiveness refers to the form of the name; for unofficial names the live motivation refers to the person named. A characteristic group of living names is forms with overt expressiveness (*Čunčo, Čirbirák, Frťko, Grňa, Lizák, Harajda, Trlaj, Kičina, Škadra, Huka* etc.).

9. <Grouping> has a special status among other onymic features since it is closely related to the anthroponymic feature < family affiliation> or the chrematonymic feature <serial>. If it is related to the feature <family affiliation>, a name demonstrates relatives within a family, including members of kinship groups. In German, these names are termed Gruppennamen. They have a plural form and in Slovak they are formed by the suffix *-ovci* (*Kubala – Kubalovci, Rybár – Rybárovci).* However, the adherents, followers, or scholars of a person named by his or her proper name are classified as appellatives (and their initial letter is written in lower case: *bernolákovci, štúrovci*) since the features "follower, adherent, scholar" do not predicate the family affiliations which are relevant to the category of personal names. Names in which <grouping> is combined with the feature <serial> belong to another subsystem. This is a rich class of chrematonyms which includes various kinds of products made in series, such as newspapers, magazines, books (*Pravda, Slovenka, Dom v stráni*), names of means of urban transport (cars, bicycles, trains, boats), cleaning and chemists' products etc.

The reflection of the content elements of a proper name in its language form confirms the perception of the proper name as a binary onymic sign.

2. 5. Modelling in onomastics. On the beginning of modelling of proper names

The concept of modelling the naming act and also modelling the whole set of onymic elements of a given class generalises proprial naming principles and leads to comprehending and depicting proprial relations, elements and their internal organisation in their deep structure (see also Šrámek, 1999). Supra-individual hierarchised features (onosemes, functions) embedded in social standards and needs have the most general character. These features constitute the content component (more precisely, semantic component) of an onymic sign. Content abstractions at a higher level are equal in some aspects in ethnic communities which lived in similar economic and social conditions. While the content component of the naming model is created by general naming principles, the proprial nomination itself is based on the rules of a given language (indeed, in the proprial sphere, their usage is quite specific). **Content models**, usually of a pragmatic character, relate to a concrete naming situation and onymy of a particular language by way of a **motivational model**. The link between the content and the word-forming model is the motivation model. In respect of expanding naming needs and various situations and also the functioning of onymic objects in social contacts, the motivations of proper names in individual classes are considerably varied but it is possible to determine certain typical situations. For example, the naming motifs of official personal names originate from more or less well-established sets (official inventories); this refers to the so-called "baptism" in a broad sense. In unofficial personal naming, living naming motifs are applied: the individual physical or mental characteristics of a person, his or her interests, job, origin, address, etc. (in Central Slovakia we have identified more than 20 different naming motifs – see Blanár – Matejčík, I. 1, 1978). Toponymic motivation models consist of features which are typical of a character or pragmatic aspect of geographical names; these are mainly location, the description of an object, ownership, membership, celebratory, a memorial feature and a residential feature (Majtán, 1996, pp. 10 – 11). These motivating features refer to the origin of a toponymy in a certain situation. As far as the motivator is concerned, logonyms as part of chrematonyms are interesting. Usually, their naming motif is a circumstance related to the area of activity of a firm or the name of its owner (Imrichová, 2002, p. 91).

A word-forming model is defined as "a word-forming pattern for a lingual depiction of the act of naming" (Šrámek, 1972, 1976). In proprial nomination in the word-forming model, the word-forming procedures of a language are used in accordance with the naming rules of a respective onymic sphere which have their local, time and frequency dimensions. The area distribution and social determination of word-forming models are mainly characteristic of toponymy and the group of living personal names. In the word-forming model, anthropobasis and anthropoformant are distinguished. In an act of communication, the word-forming model acquires its respective language form and this is what is known as a **word-forming type**. The first part of the word-forming type is its word class characteristic; in the second part, anthropoformants are given explicitly (Šrámek, 1999, Pleskalová, 1992; Blanár, 1978, 1996). The characteristic of formal aspects of living names can be intensified by distinguishing relations of equality (a name is a substantive in nom., sing.) and subordinacy (the function component is a possessive adjective or localisation with preposition) of functional components in the **syntactic model** (Jozefovič, 2006, p. 65).

I described the technique of modelling in the monograph *Living Personal Names in Central Slovakia I.1*, Blanar, 1978). In the model classification, two aspects of anthroponymic nomination are combined with graphical symbols. The content models are classified by functional components (Christian name, surname, individual characteristic, byname, living family name, house name); functional components are determined on the basis of a hierarchical set of onymic features (which form designation, onymic semantic). On the symbols of individual functional components, motifs are indicated by generalising exponents (figures, lower case). Hence, the content and motivation model are integrated in a graphical symbol (see chapters 2. 2, 2. 3, 2. 4.). For example:

Jano Ráztočan $\underline{K} + CH^p/RMD$

Tetka Eva od Zubajov – aunt Eva from the Zubajs $A - K + MD_1 = P$

Legend: / means "functional component used as..."

= means "identical with...".

In "*The Theory of Proper Names*" (Blanar, 1996) I outlined rules for describing word-forming models and types for the classification of anthroponyms. A deeper understanding of systems of personal names and, in particular, computer processing of extensive material will be required to enhance the technique of model classification. In one living name several naming models are usually combined; these are defined as *naming types*. A system of living names consists of various naming types and models.

A naming type for living personal names:

Milan Strmeň

Horár – forester Strmeň $CH^z/RMD + P=RMD$

(how to decipher the record: individual characteristic is also used as a living family name and a name of a house + surname which can also be used as a living family name and a name of a house)

word-forming model [CH/RMD] her. char. + [P=RMD] surname

word-forming type Sd + Sd

(how to read the abbreviation Sd: substantivum derived + substantivum derived).

Naming types are basic elements of onymic subsystems. Individual onymic models should be understood as prototypical (more or less open) sets of components of meaning. Their local, time and frequency dimensions show the internal structure of individual subsystems and facilitate a deeper synchronic, diachronic and confrontational description. The modelling method is considered an important methodological contribution to the development of current theoretical onomastics. The characteristic of extensive sets of living personal names requires the classification of rich and internally varied names on the principle of model abstractions. By the modelling method employed, a basis for comparison within the national language as well as for inter-ethnic confrontation (especially where content models are concerned) is formed and also it exposes (parasystemic) methods for using lingual means of the local language in proprial nomination (motivational models, word-forming models and types are dealt with).

The data obtained by the modelling method enable us to discover precisely, e.g., as far as living personal names are concerned, the use of individual functional components, the entire model

structures in various microsystems and also in larger geographical areas. In comparative research, the as yet unused average anthroponymic microsystem which is formed by the following parameters: the frequency quotient of living names per bearer, the average distribution of content models (the ratio of content models to all living names), the average itemisation of content models, the average usage of functional components (Blanár, 1996), could be contributory. In comparison with other anthroponymic systems, the significant values are those which are higher or lower than the normal average.

The description of naming models through metalanguage enables us to process and classify onymic models by statistical and area methods.

On the beginning of modelling of proper names

Currently, the modelling method based on precise PC–performed research is on the increase. In Slovakia, the modelling method in the proprial sphere has been developing since 1945[4]. Its beginnings are linked to an attempt to apply a semiotic and functional-structural approach to the research into proper names (see V. Blanár, *Osobné mená. K základom semiologickej onomastiky*, 1945, manusc. *Proper names. On the basis of semiotic onomastics*). This deals with an attempt to comprehend the structural organisation in the system of Slovak official and unofficial (living) personal names. This structure is investigated as "types of names". It was understood as an "abstracted naming paradigm" which is formed by onymic signs with a certain structure of semantic functions (cf. p. 113). From 1966 and 1967, I have been using the term **model** (of personal names). In my further research, in the description of the content aspect of personal names, I used a method of component analysis and synthesis and I also formulated the theory and method of modelling aspects of the content and motivation of proper names by defining the general naming principles in the proprial nomination of personal names (Blanár, 1970; summarised in 1996; the classification of word-forming models and types is also outlined here). The substantiation and perspective of this procedure was validated with a set of almost 60,000 living personal names from central Slovakia (Blanár – Matejčík – [Šmelík] I. 1. 1978, I. 2. 1983). As the research continues, the set of onymic features (of prototypical character) in the designation of names has been extended.

The modelling of *toponyms* was closely analysed and, using the Czech language, explained by R. Šrámek (1971, 1972/3, 1976, 1999) in the course of the process of the systematic development of his concept of functional onomastics (on the whole, close to the perception which I formulate in this contribution). A model description of the formation of geographical names in Moravia and Silesia by J. Pleskalová (1992) also points out perspectives in comparative onomastics. At this point, reference should be made to the studies by a Slovak researcher, M. Majtán (1976, 1996 and elsewhere).

translated by David J. Shearman and Adriana Shearman

References

---

[4] J. Pleskalová, 1992, p. 15: "In onymy, the model classification was first applied to anthroponymy by V. Blanár."

Beleňkaja 1969: V. D. B e l e ň k a j a. Toponimy v sostave leksičeskoj sistemy jazyka. Moskva, Nauka 1969.

Blanár 1945: V. B l a n á r. Osobné mená. K základom semiologickej onomastiky. Bratislava 1945. 138 s. Dokt. dizert. Rukopis.

Blanár 1950: V. B l a n á r. Príspevok ku štúdiu slovenských osobných a pomiestnych mien v Maďarsku. Bratislava, SAVU 1950. 139 s.

Blanár 1963: V. B l a n á r. Využitie jazykových prostriedkov v rozličných sústavách slovanských osobných mien. In: Slavische Namenforschung. Red. T. Witkowski. Berlin 1963, s. 210 – 215.

Blanár 1965: V. B l a n á r. Onomastický výskum na Slovensku. (Ciele, metódy, aktuálne úlohy.) In: Jazykovedný časopis, 16, 1965, s. 73 – 78.

Blanár 1967: V. B l a n á r. K vývinu slovanských osobných pomenovacích sústav. (Teoretické východiská). In: Třetí zasedání Mezinárodní komise pro slovanskou onomastiku při Mezinárodním komitétu slavistů v Domě vědeckých pracovníků ČSAV v Liblicích u Prahy 16., 17. 9. 1966. Red. J. Svoboda – L. Nezbedová. Praha 1967, s. 21 – 38.

Blanár 1969: V. B l a n á r. Das spezifisch Onomastische. In: Disputationes ad montium vocabula aliorumque nominum significationes pertinentes. Red. H. H. Hornung. Wien 1969, s. 81 – 87.

Blanár 1970: V. B l a n á r. Sústava živého pomenúvania osôb. In: Četvrto zasedanie na meg ´unarodnata komisija za slovenska onomastika. Govori i referati. Skopje – Ochrid 17. 9. – 23. 9. 1970. Red. B. Vidoeski et al. Skopje, Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite 1971, s. 37 – 51.

Blanár 1972: V. B l a n á r. Die soziolinguistische Problematik der Personennamen. In: Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift, 13, 1972, s. 203 – 208.

Blanár 1976: V. B l a n á r. Lingvistický a onomastický status vlastnéh3o mena. In: Onomastica, 21, 1976, s. 5 – 18. Nem.: Der linguistische und onomastische Status der Eigennamen. In: Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung, 30, 1977, s. 138 – 148. In: Reader zur Namenkunde. 1. Namentheorie. Red. F. Debus, W. Seibicke. Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 1989, s. 111 – 123.

Blanár 1977: V. B l a n á r. Poznámky k polysémii, homonymii, antonymii a synonymii vlastných mien. In: Jazykovedné štúdie, 13, 1977, s. 37 – 43.

Blanár 1985: V. B l a n á r. Vlastné meno v jazykovej komunikácii. In: V. ogólnoplska konferencja onomastyczna. Poznań 3–5 września 1985. Kśięga referatów. Red. K. Zierhoffer. Poznań, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Unviersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu 1988, s. 33 – 41.

Blanár 1996: V. B l a n á r. Teória vlastného mena. (Status, organizácia a fungovanie v spoločenskej komunikácii.) Bratislava, Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV 1996. 250 s. Nem.: Theorie des Eigennamens. (Status, Organisation und Funktionieren der Eigennamen in der gesellschaftlichen Kommunikation.) Hildesheim – Zürich – New York 2001. 207 s.

Blanár 1998: V. B l a n á r. Teória vlastného mena zo slovanského porovnávacieho hľadiska. In: XII. medzinárodný zjazd slavistov v Krakove. Red. J. Doruľa. Bratislava, Slovenský komitét slavistov a Slavistický kabinet SAV 1998, s. 169 – 182.

Blanár 2001: V. B l a n á r. Problematika vývinu pomenúvania osôb. In: Studia Academica Slovaca, 30. Prednášky 37. letnej školy slovenského jazyka a kultúry. Red. J. Mlacek. Bratislava, Stimul 2001, s. 59 – 72.

Blanár 2006: V. B l a n á r. Wie weiter in der Theorie der Onomastik? (Zum internationalen onomastichen Handbuch „Namenarten und ihe Erforschung".) In: Namenkundliche Informationen 87/88, 2006, s. 17 – 31. Sonderdruck.

Blanár 2006: V. B l a n á r. Súvzťažnosť obsahovej a formálnej stránky onymického znaku. In: Jazykovedný časopis, 57, 2006, s. 89 – 100.

Blanár 2004: V. B l a n á r. Pragmatickolingvistické metódy a problematika v onomastike. In: Jazykovedný časopis, 55, 2004, s. 3 – 19.

Blanár, Matejčík 1983: V. B l a n á r, J. Matejčík. Živé mená na strednom Slovensku. I. 1. Designácia osobného mena. Bratislava, Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo 1978. 416 s. I. 2. Distribúcia obsahových modelov. Maritn, Osveta 1983. 647 s.

Brendler 2004: S. B r e n d l e r. Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik. Ed. Andrea Brendler a Silvio Brendler. Hamburg, Baar 2004. 1024 s., s. 33 – 48.

Brendler 2002: S. B r e n d l e r. Über den gerechten Tod der Auffassung von Namen als bilaterales Zeichen. In: Proceedings of the 21st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences. Uppsala 19–24 August 2002. Ed. E. Bryla et al. Uppsala, Sprok - och folkminnesinstitutet 2005, s. 98 – 117.

Carnap 1947: R. C a r n a p. Meaning and Necessity. Chicago, Chicago University Press 1947.

Čermák 2001: F. Č e r m á k. Jazyka a jazykověda. Přehled a slovníky. Praha, Karolinum 2001. 341 s.

Debus 1985: F. D e b u s. Zur Pragmatik der Namengebung und Namengebrauch in unserer Zeit. In: Der Eigenname in Sprache und Gesellschaft. I. Verhandlungen im Plenum. Red. E. Eichler et al. 15. Internationaler Kongreß für Namenforschung (13. – 17. August 1984). Leipzig 1985, s. 49 – 75.

Dolník 1995: J. D o l n í k. Forma a význam vlastného mena. In: Slavica Slovaca, 30, 1995, s. 105 – 111.

Dolník 1998: J. D o l n í k. K pragmatike vlastných mien. In: XIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Zborník materiálov. Zost. M. Majtán – P. Žigo. Bratislava 1998, s. 21 – 25.

Dolník 2003: J. D o l n í k. Lexikológia. Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského 2003. 236 s.

Ďurčo 1996: P. Ď u r č o. Vlastné mená na Slovensku. In: Studia Academica Slovaca, 25. Prednášky 32. letného seminára slovenského jazyka a kultúry. Red. J. Mlacek. Bratislava, Stimul 1996, s. 54 – 60. Eichler

Eichler 1983: E. E i c h l e r. Das integrierte (slawisch-deutsche) Toponym in der lexikographischen Bearbeitung. In: VIII. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Banská Bystrica – Dedinky 2. – 6. júna 1980. Zborník materiálov. Red. M. Majtán. Bratislava – Banská Bystrica – Prešov 1983, s. 24 – 31.

Eichler 1988: E. E i c h l e r. Probleme der onomastischen Rekonstruktion als linguistisches Universale. In: Probleme der Namenbildung. Rekonstruktion der Eigennamen und der ihnen zugrundeliegenden Appellative. Uppsala 1988, s. 91 – 103.

Eichler, Šrámek 1988: E. E i c h l e r, R. Š r á m e k. Die Strukturtypen der slawischen Ortsnamen. Strukturní typy slovanské oikonymie. Namenkundliche Informationen. Sonderheft. Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Universität 1988.   Gahér

Fiske 1992: J. F i s k e. Introduction to communication studies. London 1992.

Frege 1892: G. F r e g e. Über. Sinn und Bedeutung. München 1892.

Frege 1999: G. F r e g e. Výklady o smyslu a významu. In: J. Fiala (ed.) Analytická filosofie. První čítanka. Plzeň 1999, s. 1 – 13.

Gahér 2006: F. G a h é r. Stoická sémantika a logika z pohľadu intenzionálnej logiky. Bratislava, Univerzita Komenského 2006. 245 s.

Goetz 1993: H. W. G o e t z. Proseminar Geschiche. Mittelalter. 22 Abbildungen. 13 Texte. Stuttgart 1993.

Halaga 1972: O. R. H a l a g a. Tvorenie osobných mien v najstaršej košickej mestskej knihe (1394 – 1405). In: Zborník materiálov z III. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie v Banskej Bystrici (4. – 6. 11. 1970). Red. V. Blanár. B. Bystrica 1972, s. 188 – 215.

Hansack 1990: E. H a n s a c k. Bedeutung, Begriff, Name. Regensburg. Studia et exempla linguistica et philologica. Series II: Studia minora I. Editor Klaus Trost. Tom I. Regensburg 1990.

Hansack 2000: E. H a n s a c k. Der Name im Sprachsystem: Grundprobleme der Sprachtheorie. Regensburg Roderer. Studia et exempla linguistica et philologica, Series I: Studia maiora 5. Regensburg 2000.

Hansack 2004: E. H a n s a c k. Das Wesen des Namens. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium de Onomastik. Hrsg. A. Brendler und S. Brendler. Hamburg, Baar 2004, s. 51 – 65.

Haraj 2006: I. H a r a j. Antroponymická sústava u starých Grékov. In: Slavica Slovaca, 41, 2006, č. 1, s. 50 – 60.

Horecký 2005: J. H o r e c k ý. Priezvisko ako jazykový znak. In: Kultúra slova, 39, 2005, č. 1, s. 16 – 17.

Christoph 1987: E. - M. H o r e c k ý. Studien zur Semantik von Eigenanmen. (Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen und deutschen Onomastik). Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Universität 1987. Namenkundliche Informationen: Beiheft 10. Imrichova

Imrichová 2002: M. I m r i c h o v á. Logonymá v systéme slovenčiny. Prešov, Fakulta humanitných a prírodných vied PU 2002. 142 s.

Jozefovič 2006: M. J o z e f o v i č. Modelovanie živých osobných mien na strednom Slovensku. Bratislava, Pedagogická fakulta UK 2006. 157 s. Dizertačná práca.

Kaleta 1989: Z. K a l e t a. The evolutionary stages of Slavonic surnames in the context of European namegiving. In: Onoma, 29, 1989, s. 11 – 25.

Kalverkämper 1978: H. K a l v e r k ä m p e. Textlinguistik der Eigennamen. Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta 1978.

Kalverkämper 1997: H. K a l v e r k ä m p e. Onomastik als angewandte Semiotik. In: Namenkundliche Informationen, 71/72, 1997, s. 41 – 46.

Kany 1995: W. K a n y. Namenverwendung zwischen öffentlich und privat. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. Hrsg. E. Eichler et al. 1. Teilband. Berlin – New York 1995, s. 509 – 514.

Karpenko 1967: J. A. K a r p e n k o. Toponimična systema i systemnisť toponimiji. In: Povidomlennja Ukrajinśkoj onomastyčnoj komisji, 2, 1967, s. 3 – 12.

Kohlheim 1977: V. K o h l h e i m. Zur Erforschung der Diffusion onomastischer Innovationen. In: Beiträge zur Namenforschung, N. F., 12, 1977, s. 1 – 34.

Kohlheim 1981: V. K o h l h e i m. Diffusionstheoretische Aspekte spätmittelalterlicher Anthroponymie. Die Verbreitung der Rufnamengebung nach Heiligennamen in Regensburg bis a. 1375. In: Deutsch-slawische Namenforschung. Hrsg. H. B. Harder. Marburg/Lahn 1981, s. 137 – 157.

Majtán 1992: M. M a j t á n. K funkčnímu pojetí systému vlastních jmen. In: Slovo a slovesnost, 53, 1992, s. 211 – 214.

Kripke 2002: S. K r i p k e. Majtán Naming and Necessity. In: Davidson, Donald, Harman, Gilbert (ed. Cambridge) 1972. Slov.: Pomenovanie a nevyhnutnosť. Bratislava, Kalligram 2002.

Krüger 2004: D. K r ü g e r. Textlinguistische Methoden der Namenforschung. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik. Hrsg. von A. Brendler und S. Brendler. Hamburg, Baar 2004, s. 123 – 152.

Kuryłowicz 1956: J e. K u r y ł o w i c z. La position linguistique de nom propre. In: Onomastica, 2, 1956, s. 1 – 14.

Langendonck 1995: W. V. L a n g e n d o n c k Name systems and name strata. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. Hrsg. E. Eichler et al. 1. Teilband. Berlin – New York 1995, s. 485 – 489

Majtán 1976: M. M a j t á n. Mimojazyková stránka toponyma. In: VI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 4. – 6. apríla 1974. Red. M. Majtán. Bratislava 1976, s. 31 – 37.

Majtán 1996: M. M a j t á n. Z lexiky slovenskej toponymie. Bratislava, Veda 1996. 191 s.

Materna 1999: P. M a t e r n a. Concepts and Objects. In: Acta Philosophica Fennica, vol. 63. Helsinki 1999.

Mikkonen, Paikkala 1992: P. M i k k o n e n, S. P a i k k a l a. Sukunimet. Helsinki 1992, s. 31 – 45.

Nicolaisen 1995.: W. F. H. N i c o l a i s e n. Name and Appellative. In: Namenforschung. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik. Hrsg. E. Eichler et al. 1. Teilband. Berlin – New York 1995, s. 384 – 393

Paikkala, Sirrka: S. P a i k k a l a. Finnische Familiennamen auf *-(i)nen*. In: Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica, 6, 1988, s 27 – 69.

Paikkala, Paikkala 1988: S. P a i k k a l a J. P a i k k a l a. Statistische Angaben aus den Familiennamen der Finnen. Sukuviesti 1988.

Pleskalová 1992: J. P l e s k a l o v á. Tvoření pomístních jmen na Moravě a ve Slezsku. Jinočany, nakl. H + H 1992. 150 s.

Pulgram 1950/1951: E. P u l g r a m. Historisch - soziologische Betrachtung des modernen Familiennamens. In: Beiträge zur Namenforschung, 2, 1950/1951, s. 132 – 165.

Rübekeil 2004: S t. R ü b e k e i l. Stammes- und Völkernamen. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik. Hrsg. A. Brendler und S. Brendler. Hamburg, Baar 2004, s. 743 – 771.

Sokolová 2006: M. S o k o l o v á. Systémové modely tvorenia obyvateľských mien a etnoným v slovenčine. In: Slovenská reč, 71, 2006, č. 4, s. 205 – 223.

Strawson 1985.: P. F. S t r a w s o n. Über Referenz. Übersetzt von J. Schulte. In: U. Wolf (ed.), Eigennamen. Dokumentation einer Kontroverse. Frankfurt a. M. 1985, s. 94 – 126.

Svoboda 1964: J. S t r a w s o n. Staročeská osobní jména a naše příjmení. Praha, naklad. Československé akademie věd 1964. 317 s.

Superanskaja 1973: A. V. S u p e r a n s k a j a. Občšaja teorija imeni sobstvennogo. Moskva, Izd. Nauka 1973. 366 s.

Šmelík 1970: L. Š m e l í k. Využitie štatistickej metódy v onomastike. In: Zborník materiálov zo sympózia o teoretických a metodologických otázkach onomastiky a II. slovenskej onomastickej konferencie v Nitre 22. – 24. mája 1969. Red. Š. Krištof. Bratislava 1970, s. 85 – 93.

Šmelík 1994: L. Š m e l í k. Poznámky k antroponymii Záhoria. In: Jazyková a mimojazyková stránka vlastných mien. XI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 19. – 20. mája 1994. Zborník referátov. Red. E. Krošláková. Bratislava – Nitra 1994, s. 124 – 128.

Šrámek 1972: R. Š r á m e k. Toponymické modely a toponymický systém. In: Slovo a slovesnost, 33, 1972, s. 304 – 318. Nem.: Zum Begriff „Modell" und „System" in der tschechischen Toponymie. In: Onoma, 27, 1972/3, s. 55 – 75.

Šrámek 1974: R. Š r á m e k. Onymický príznak. In: VI. slovenská onomastická konferencia. Nitra 4. – 6. apríla 1974. Zborník materiálov. Red. M. Majtán. Bratislava 1976, s. 7 – 14.

Šrámek 1976: R. Š r á m e k. Slovotvorný model v české toponymii. In: Slovo a slovesnosť, 37, 1976, s. 112 – 120.

Šrámek 1986: R. Š r á m e k. Teorie onomastiky a roviny propriálního pojmenování. In: Slovo a slovesnost, 47, 1986, s. 16 – 28.

Šrámek 1999: R. Š r á m e k. Úvod do obecné onomastiky. Brno, Masarykova univerzita 1999. 191 + 19 mapových príloh.

Wenzel 2004: W. W e n z e l. Familiennamen. In: Namenarten und ihre Erforschung. Ein Lehrbuch für das Studium der Onomastik. Hrsg. A. Brendler und S. Brendler. Hamburg, Baar 2004, s. 705 – 742.

Zabrocki 1960: L. Z a b r o c k i. Gesetze bei Übernahme von fremden Orts- und Flurnamen. Probleme einer Betrachtungsweise. In: VI. Internationaler Kongreß für Namenforschung München 24. – 28. August. Kongreßberichte. Band 3. München 1960, s. 791 – 797.

Zouhar 2004: M. Z o u h a r. Podoby referencie. Bratislava, IRIS 2004. 255 s.

Zouhar 2006: M. Z o u h a r. Rigidná designácia. Metafyzická téma vo filozofii jazyka. Bratislava, Infopress 2006.